



July 8, 2010

Reply to Attn. of: A/D-1422/RMS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: X/Deputy Director

SUBJECT: Source Selection Statement under Request for Quotes (RFQ)
DD10326428Q, Building High Performance Organizations (HPO) and
Facilitating Peer Mentoring and Development

This memorandum documents the basis for my decision as Source Selection Authority (SSA) to select Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) (Alexandria, VA) for award of a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) under the subject solicitation. This is a NASA Dryden Flight Research Center solicitation.

Procurement Background

This procurement was solicited and evaluated under the provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Parts 8 and 12. Quotations in response to this solicitation were received from the following firms:

- Denisoff Consulting Group (Redondo Beach, CA)
- Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) (Alexandria, VA)
 - Subcontractor: Hayward & Associates (San Jose, CA)
- White Sand Consultants, Inc. (Trabuco Canyon, CA)

The appointed evaluation team concluded evaluation of the offers on June 30, 2010. Their assessment included consideration of the following factors listed in the RFQ: technical, past performance and price evaluation. The technical and past performance factors are approximately equal in importance and, when combined, are significantly more important than price. Of the two technical criteria, staffing is more important than understanding the requirement.

Details of the evaluation results and findings narratives are included in slides presented to me and other senior Center personnel by team members on July 6, 2010. During the presentation, I asked questions and received clarifications to the team's findings, as needed to more accurately reflect the evaluation results. I am confident that those results form a solid basis upon which I may make this selection decision.

Evaluation Results

In performing their initial assessment, and prior to presenting the results of their evaluation, the team identified an omission relative to the Denisoff proposal. Paragraph C), Price, under Section 1, Evaluation Factors for Award, of the RFQ requires potential proposers to calculate the price for performing a "sample call order" described in the solicitation. In reviewing the Denisoff pricing proposal, it became apparent that they had not included a calculated price for performing the sample call order. This omission was verified by the DFRC Acquisition Management Office Mathematician, Linda Gaugler, in an email dated April 15, 2010.

The absence of this price prevented the Government from completely evaluating the Denisoff price proposal, or in making any determination of price fairness or reasonableness. The omission was determined of sufficient importance to warrant Denisoff's exclusion from further consideration, pursuant to NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-70. By letter dated April 23, 2010, Denisoff was informed that their proposal was determined to be unacceptable and eliminated from further consideration. They acknowledged receipt of the notice. No protest of this determination was submitted to the Agency or the General Accountability Office during the 10-day period prescribed by FAR 33.103.

In reviewing the team's evaluation results for the remaining two firms, I note that the quotation from HumRRO has a technical characterization of Excellent. This conclusion results from the following significant strengths:

1. The proposer's choice of identified labor categories and hours for each task of the sample call order ensures that these efforts will be performed in an exceptional manner. For example, they recognize the need to focus on various research and administrative requirements and allocate an appropriate number of hours to each these activities. They also devote sufficient hours solely to accomplish the Balanced Scorecard and High Performance Organizations (HPO) initiatives.
2. Proposer demonstrates working knowledge of HPO concepts and has a detailed implementation approach for Dryden. They will assess the tools we are currently using to ensure their validity and that they are aligned with our HPO initiatives. The proposer demonstrates clear understanding of the HPO train-the-trainer requirement and will supply a PowerPoint presentation, participant workbook, and a trainer's manual to the trainers who take the course. They will compare assessment results for individual participants to Dryden's HPO needs and determine the gaps. The proposer has an excellent approach for the collection and analysis of data and communicating that information to management.
3. The proposer offers several types of assessments. Their behavioral assessment is extensive and contains multiple foci. This will help ensure accurate portrayal of participant strengths and potential weaknesses. In order to prevent waste and duplication of effort, the proposer has contingency plan for participants who have had 360 or 540 assessments within the past two years.

Additionally, the HumRRO technical proposal has three regular (as distinguished from significant) strengths, two regular weaknesses, and no significant weaknesses.

I further note that the quotation from White Sand Consulting Group has a technical characterization of Fair. This conclusion results from the following significant findings:

Significant Strengths:

1. The proposer will conduct a variety of assessments and recognizes OPM's role in conducting 360 assessments. They propose using non-participative observation and Behavioral Observation (BO) to gather information to help our staff improve workplace behaviors. This will help ensure accurate portrayal of participant strengths and potential weaknesses.
2. Proposer incorporates principles from Drahosz's "The Keys to Mentoring Success" (a 7-step guide for the establishment and implementing of successful and dynamic mentoring programs) which will align with our existing mentoring program because it is based on the same principles. They also offer to teach peer mentors transferable skills like time and stress management, conflict resolution, collaborations, problem solving and decision-making skills, communication and listening skills, empathy, respect and trust.

Significant Weaknesses:

1. It is difficult to determine how the proposed labor is allocated in performing some portions of the sample call order. For example, sixty hours is allocated for 3 days of behavioral observation but there is no way to discern how many of the hours will be spent in observation and how many hours will be spent completing documentation. Also, the proposer described having to perform Balanced Scorecard initiatives but it is not reflected in their labor identification. By not knowing how proposed labor is to be utilized, it is difficult to determine whether qualified staff will be provided to perform these sample call order responsibilities.
2. The proposer underestimated the number of hours it will take to execute portions of the sample call order. For example, preparation, documentation, execution of and follow-up tasks for the DFRC Executive Leadership Team meetings will require significantly more effort than the hours listed (20). Additionally, it will take more than 9 hours to organize, prepare, facilitate, and conduct follow-up for the two 1 ½ hour sessions of the facilitated peer mentoring group. The proposer also projects only 40 hours directly related to HPO. Having too few hours assigned to these responsibilities jeopardizes effective performance.
3. The proposer's explanation of Balanced Scorecard and HPO is generic. It doesn't discuss possible approaches or methods to be used at Dryden or in general. For instance, they discuss using the "Jellyfish Approach" but provide little details as to what the approach is. The proposer's discussion of the HPO Train-the-Trainer course does not seem to address any HPO principles, nor is it designed to teach employees how to train others on HPO concepts, but appears to be general instruction for professional trainers who are new to the field or need to brush up on their skills. As a result, there is little Government confidence that the proposer understands these essential elements of the anticipated effort.

Additionally, the White Sand technical proposal has no regular strengths and four regular weaknesses.

Under the Past Performance factor, I find that the HumRRO quotation is characterized with a Very High confidence level. This rating results from the following significant strengths:

1. Questionnaire respondents characterized the proposer's performance as excellent 22 times and as very good 2 times. There were no good, fair or poor characterizations.
2. Subcontractor, Hayward and Associates, has extensive experience with NASA both as an employee and as a contractor. They have been trained on the NASA 540, helped prepare NASA's coaching guidelines, and have set up mentoring and coaching programs at the center level.

Additionally, the HumRRO past performance proposal has three regular strengths, no regular weaknesses and no significant weaknesses.

The White Sand Consulting Group past performance proposal has no significant strengths or significant weaknesses, four regular strengths and two regular weaknesses, and is characterized with a Moderate confidence level.

Relative to the price evaluation, there were no adjustments to quoted amounts for any proposers resulting from calculation errors or other Government corrections. I find that HumRRO's proposed price of \$146,111 for the sample call order is fair and reasonable, as evidenced by the identification of appropriate numbers and categories of labor. The price proposed by White Sand Consulting Group of \$57,755 is not considered reasonable and may result in their inability to perform all effort anticipated in the sample order.


Source Selection Decision

I make the following decision on the basis of an integrated assessment of all three evaluation factors.

Using the findings presented by the evaluation team in the July 6, 2010 presentation, and not taking any exceptions to the results presented, I conclude that the proposal from HumRRO forms a solid basis for their selection and award. They have an excellent technical characterization and a very high past performance confidence level. Their proposed price for the sample call order, while significantly higher than the price proposed by White Sand Consulting Group, is considered fair and reasonable and an appropriate reflection of the required effort.

I acknowledge serious technical risks associated with the White Sand proposal. These include not understanding essential aspects of the Statement of Work (SOW) associated with the Balanced Scorecard and High Performance Organization initiatives. It is also likely that additional costs would be incurred by White Sand Consulting Group to compensate for or resolve any misunderstanding originating with these initiatives. During the 5-year potential period of this Order, these costs could accumulate to very significant amounts.

Based upon the findings presented, and my conclusions given above, I determine that the proposal received from HumRRO to be the best overall value to the Government. I further conclude that holding discussions would not likely result in another offer overcoming that decision. Therefore, I select HumRRO for an award of a BPA resulting from this solicitation without final revisions being requested.



Patrick Stoliker

7/12/2010

Date